

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, 34, and 35 are now amended. These claim amendment are fully supported by the application as filed and do not present new matter. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicants' representative, Brent G. Seitz, thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephonic interview of September 10, 2004. During this interview, differences between the art of record and the pending claims were discussed. No agreements were reached during this interview.

During the interview, the Examiner indicated that U.S. Patent No. 6,507,384 might be relevant to Applicants application. Applicants wish to point out that the '384 reference was filed in the U.S. on March 24, 2000, which is later than Applicants' foreign priority date of March 26, 1999 (JP Ref. No. 11-84769). Therefore, Applicants can easily overcome any rejection based on the '384 reference by perfecting their priority to JP 11-84769.

DRAWINGS

The Office Action makes a request for formal drawings, but does not indicate which drawings are not acceptable or for what reason. The only non-formal feature of the figures that Applicants can locate is the handwritten "prior art" designation of Figures 7 and 8.

Therefore, Applicants have attached replacement sheets for the Examiner's approval containing Figures 7 and 8 in which the designation "prior art" has been formalized.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugimoto et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,777,610). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended Claims 1, 34, and 35 recite, with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only as the application includes numerous embodiments, a driver integrated circuit [27/28] mounted directly over the glass substrate [23]. Amended Claims 1, 34, and 35 further recite at least a portion of said circuit board 22 overlapping the glass substrate 23.

The Sugimoto et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 4, a driver integrated circuit 15/16 mounted to a flexible wiring board 13/19. See Col. 10, Lines 45-49. The driver integrated circuit 15/16 is not mounted directly over a glass substrate. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest a driver integrated circuit mounted directly over a glass substrate as set forth in amended Claims 1, 34, and 35.

The Sugimoto et al. reference further appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 4, a circuit board 14 spaced apart from the glass substrates 11a and 11b. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest at least a portion of the circuit board overlapping the glass substrate, as set forth in amended Claims 1, 34, and 35.

Therefore, the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to render obvious amended Claims 1, 34, and 35 and those claims dependent therefrom. Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claims 1, 34, 35, and those claims dependent therefrom.

Amended Claim 2 recites, in part and with reference to Figure 2 for exemplary purposes only as this invention includes numerous embodiments, “one of the glass substrates [23/24] having an extended area [23A/24A] that extends integrally from one of the glass substrates [23/24],” “a driver integrated circuit [27/28] mounted directly over the extended area,” and “at least a portion of said control circuit board [22] overlapping the glass substrate [23]” (emphasis added).

Amended Claims 3 and 12 generally recite, in part, a first extended area 24A that extends integrally from the first glass substrate 24, a second extended area 23A that extends integrally from the second glass substrate 23, a scanning driver integrated circuit 31 mounted directly on the first extended area 24A, a data-signal driver integrated circuit 27/28 mounted directly on the second extended area 23A, and at least a portion of a control circuit board 22 overlapping at least one of the first glass substrate and the second glass substrate.

The Sugimoto et al. reference appears to disclose, with reference to Figure 4, glass substrates 11a/11b, a flexible wiring board 13/19 mounted to one or more substrates 11, and a circuit board 14. The circuit board 14 is spaced apart from the substrates 11 and does not overlap the substrates 11. A driver IC 16 is mounted to the wiring board 19 at a position directly above the circuit board 14 and not above or on the substrates 11. A driver IC 15 is mounted to the wiring board 13 not above the substrates 11.

The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest mounting driver ICs directly on or over extended areas of the substrates that are integral with the substrates, as set forth in amended Claims 2, 3, and 12. Further, the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest at least a portion of a circuit board or a control circuit board overlapping the glass substrate. Therefore the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest each and every feature of amended Claims 2, 3, and 12. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection of Claims 2, 3, and 12 and those claims dependent therefrom.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, in part and with reference to Figures 1 and 2 for exemplary purposes only, a circuit board 22 having a control circuit 120 that overlaps the driver integrated circuit 27/28. As set forth on page 15 of the application as filed, the control circuit 120 is a driving control circuit that controls a scanning-signal driving circuit 300 and a data-signal driving circuit 200. In contrast, the Sugimoto et al. reference appears to disclose a control board 17 that is spaced apart from the glass substrates 11 and fails to overlap the driver IC's 15/16. The Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest a circuit board having a control circuit that overlaps a driver integrated circuit, as set forth in amended Claim 11. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this Section 103 rejection because the Sugimoto et al. reference fails to suggest each element of amended Claim 11.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Dated: Sept 14, 2004

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600
GGS/BEW/BGS/les

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley, Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344